

## **REMARKS**

### **I. Amendments**

By this amendment, claims 14-16 have been amended. This amendment adds no new matter to the specification. Support for the amendment may be found in the specification and claims as originally filed.

The specification has also been modified to update the parentage statement.

No amendment of inventorship is necessitated by this amendment.

### **II. Acknowledgement of the Allowable Claims**

Applicants gratefully acknowledge the Examiner's indication of allowability of claims 1-3, 5, 6, 9 and 11-13.

### **III. Discussion of the Objection to Claims 14 and 15**

Claims 14 and 15 have been objected to as allegedly being of improper dependent format.

The Examiner has suggested re-writing these claims as independent claims, which the Applicants have done by this amendment.

Therefore Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the objection to claims 14 and 15.

### **IV. Discussion of the Rejection of Claim 16 under 35 U.S.C. Sec. 112, First Paragraph**

Claim 16 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. Sec. 112, first paragraph, as allegedly lacking enablement in the recitation of treating cancer and in the recitation of prevention of certain conditions. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

To advance prosecution of the case, Applicants have amended claim 16 to delete "preventing and" and "cancer".

Therefore Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. Sec. 112, first paragraph rejection of claim 16.

**V. Discussion of the Rejection of Claim 4 under 35 U.S.C. Sec. 112, Second Paragraph**

Claim 4 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. Sec. 112, second paragraph, as allegedly being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicants regard as the invention. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Applicants respectfully submit that the claim is in fact correct as filed. When the second partial structure in claim 4 is selected as R<sup>1</sup>, formula [I] in claim 1 has a sulfide on the left-hand side of the molecule. When the first partial structure in claim 1 is selected as R<sup>1</sup>, formula [I] in claim 1 has a disulfide on the left-hand side of the molecule. So the second partial structure, which is an option for R<sup>1</sup> is not incorrect in not containing a sulfur; as formula [I] may be a sulfide or a disulfide. Note also that there can be more than one R<sup>1</sup>, and that each R<sup>1</sup> may be the same or different as long as it falls under one of the two partial structures of claim 4.

Therefore Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. Sec. 112, second paragraph rejection.

## VI. Conclusion

Reconsideration of the pending claims as amended and allowance is requested.

Should the Examiner believe that a conference with Applicants' attorney would advance prosecution of this application, the Examiner is respectfully requested to call Applicants' attorney at (847) 383-3391.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: February 25, 2005

Elaine M Ramesh

(847) 383-3391

(847) 383-3372

Elaine M. Ramesh, Ph.D., Reg. No. 43,032

Mark Chao, Ph.D., Reg. No. 37,293

Attorney for Applicants

Customer No. 23115

Takeda Pharmaceuticals North America, Inc.  
Intellectual Property Department  
475 Half Day Road  
Lincolnshire, IL 60069 USA

### Certificate of Mailing under 37 CFR 1.10

The undersigned hereby certifies that this document, along with any attachments, is being deposited in an envelope addressed to The Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks, with sufficient postage with the United States Postal Service EXPRESS MAIL Post Office to Addressee Service on this date February 25, 2005

Express Mail Label No. EV 524907558 US

Dawn Hackbert

Printed Name: Dawn Hackbert